



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/321,743	05/28/1999	LEE C. HAROLD	53470.000012	6991

29315 7590 11/17/2004

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 900
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

SINGH, RACHNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/321,743	HAROLD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rachna Singh	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>8/18/04</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to: RCE filed 8/17/04 and IDS filed 8/17/04.
2. Claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 18, and 24 are independent claims.
3. Examiner contacted the attorney of record, James Gaato and Bradford Blaise on October 28, 2004 and again on November 4, 2004 to schedule an interview, as requested by Applicant with the submission of an RCE on August 18, 2004. Applicant's representative was requested to call Examiner to schedule an interview; however, neither attempt resulted in the Applicant returning Examiner's call. No new arguments or amendments were submitted in response to the final office action mailed on 2/20/04 or in the filing of the RCE, thus being as there are no arguments or amendments to address, this action is being made final.
4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 8/18/04 is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-13, 15-20, and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yost et al., US Patent 6,567,796 B1, 5/20/03 (filed 7/1/99, provisional filed 3/23/99).

In reference to claims 1, 10, and 18, Yost teaches a system and method for an automatic OLAP report broadcast system. Yost discloses the use of templates that define a report format and specify attributes, dimensions, and display properties that define the report. His system comprises the following:

- Transmission of OLAP report output to a user output device. The user may select a project which is a collection of reports (compare to workbook) to be selected for processing in the OLAP system. See column 8, lines 34-57. Compare to ***“report requesting means . . . for processing by an OLAP system”***.

- Templates for defining report format. See column 6, lines 31-62. A format module for formatting the results into a format corresponding to the subscriber (user).

Personalization module used to enable users to input personalized choices and define filters for the project. A user can tailor display format of a report using the personalization module. A project may comprise multiple reports. See column 8.

Compare to ***“format specification means for enabling the user to select a format for each report in the workbook.”***

While Yost does not use the term “workbook” he does indicate that “project” includes a plurality of reports which is analogous to a workbook. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a format specification means for a workbook since it existed for a project which also consists of a plurality of reports.

In reference to claims 2, 11, and 19, Yost teaches that a user may define filters/formats on a global level or report level. See column 8, lines 34-49.

In reference to claims 3, 12, and 20, Yost teaches that some personalization filters/formats may be assigned for all of the reports or for a particular report. Furthermore, Yost teaches the hierarchical nature of some OLAP systems in which a user can perform multidimensional analysis on data. There are more detailed levels of data in a hierarchical set-up. See columns 3-4. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Yost's multidimensional hierarchy into his formatting feature to have lower level formats supersede higher level formats since he already takes into account the nature of the hierarchy.

In reference to claims 4 and 13, Yost teaches that the levels of format range from global formats to report formats to attribute/element format and value formats. See column 6, lines 31-62 and column 8.

In reference to claims 6, 15, and 22, Yost teaches that the format of one of the reports may comprise a grid or graph. See columns 6-8.

In reference to claims 7 and 16, Yost teaches that a user can apply filters to apply to the report. See column 8.

In reference to claims 8, 17, and 23, Yost teaches a personalization of the report output in which a user can specify the format in which the report is presented. See column 6 and column 8.

7. Claims 5, 9, 14, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yost et al., US Patent 6,567,796 B1, 5/20/03 (filed 7/1/99, provisional filed 3/23/99) in view of Siow et al., US Patent 6,301,590, 10/9/2001 (filed 8/11/97).

In reference to claims 5, 14, and 21, Yost does not disclose a format of a merged report; however, Siow discloses a system in which the user can specify multiple reports and format for the display of the multiple reports on a single page. See column 9, lines 32-61. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Siow's system of merging reports into Yost's system since it allows a user to present information from multiple reports within a workbook in a single presentation. Both Siow and Yost are concerned with reports within a workbook (or project).

In reference to claim 9, Yost's system does not teach a scripted format created by the user; however, Siow discloses a system for formatting and displaying reports from data on the Internet. The data is obtained for a report by accessing a data repository. Siow discloses using script language to format the report. See column 2. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Siow's method of formatting a report obtained from data in a repository into Yost's system for requesting and formatting reports in a workbook since using script language for formatting was well known in the art. Moreover, both Siow and Yost are concerned with reports within a workbook (or project).

8. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yost et al., US Patent 6,567,796 B1, 5/20/03 (filed 7/1/99, provisional filed 3/23/99) in view of Cook et al., US Patent 6,201,948 B1, 3/13/01 (filed 3/16/98).

In reference to claim 24, Yost teaches a system and method for an automatic OLAP report broadcast system. Yost discloses the use of templates that define a report

Art Unit: 2176

format and specify attributes, dimensions, and display properties that define the report.

His system comprises the following:

-Transmission of OLAP report output to a user output device. The user may select a project which is a collection of reports (compare to workbook) to be selected for processing in the OLAP system. See column 8, lines 34-57. Compare to ***“report requesting means . . .for processing by an OLAP system”***.

-Templates for defining report format. See column 6, lines 31-62. A format module for formatting the results into a format corresponding to the subscriber (user).

Personalization module used to enable users to input personalized choices and define filters for the project. A user can tailor display format of a report using the personalization module. A project may comprise multiple reports. See column 8.

Compare to ***“format specification means for enabling the user to select a format for each report in the workbook.”***

While Yost does not use the term “workbook” he does indicate that “project” includes a plurality of reports which is analogous to a workbook. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a format specification means for a workbook since it existed for a project which also consists of a plurality of reports.

Yost does not teach asynchronous processing; however, Cook does. Cook teaches that that a response can be generated asynchronously to a student using software. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to process report

Art Unit: 2176

generation asynchronously since it was well known in the art at the time of the invention to present information asynchronously as taught by Cook. See column 12.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is 571-272-4099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090.

RS
11/15/04


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER